IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 3726 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

RAKESH SHARADCHANDRA SHAH

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 3726 of 2001

MR HR PRAJAPATI for Petitioner No. 1

MR S.S.PATEL, AGP for Respondents No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

Date of decision: 12/10/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

In exercise of powers under Section 3(2) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 ('the Act' for short), The Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad City, Ahmedabad, vide order dated February 16, 2001 (Annexure-A to the petition) detained the petitioner/detenu.

2. The averments made in the petition and the grounds of detention order dated February 16, 2001 manifest that the petitioner is a dangerous person within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Act and as two FIRs for commission of offences under Sections 337, 338, 304(2), 420, 418, 34, 429, 120B of the IPC and for the offences under Sections 3(2) (c) (d), 7(1) (i) (ii) and 2 punishable under Section 42 of the Gujarat Ownership of Flats Act are registered with Maninagar Police Station against the detenu and according to the detaining authority his activities are prejudicial to the maintenance of public order and therefore, powers under Section 9(2) of the Act were exercised by the detaining authority.

3. By filing this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner has assailed the impugned order of detention on various grounds and prayed to issue a writ of habeas corpus or any other appropriate writ or order quashing and setting aside the impugned order of detention and setting him at liberty forthwith.

4. The petitioner has challenged the order of detention on various grounds. Mr H.R.Prajapati, learned advocate for the petitioner has restricted his arguments to the effect that subjective satisfaction recorded by the detaining authority under Section 9(2) of the Act cannot be considered as genuine. In order to substantiate his arguments he contended that the detaining authority has not supplied the legible copies of the documents relied upon by the petitioner while passing the impugned order and on this ground alone this petition deserves to be allowed as the right of the petitioner to make an effective representation is jeopardized. The infirmity in this regard is violative of constitutional safeguard enshrined in Article 22(5) of the Constitution. He, therefore, urged to allow the petition and prayed to set the petitioner at liberty forthwith.

5. Mr. S.S.Patel, learned AGP has appeared on behalf of the respondent State and has opposed the petition by filing reply affidavit sworn by P.C.Pande, Police Commissioner, Ahmedabad City, Ahmedabad. He, however, does not dispute the fact that so far as page Nos. 113, 337 and 375 which are the documents relating to the FIRs they are illegible and therefore, urged that appropriate order may be passed in light of the principles of law enunciated by the Supreme Court and this Court.

6. I have considered the submissions advanced by the learned advocates appearing for the parties. I have also perused the averments made in the petition as well as the documents annexed therewith and the impugned order of detention and the judgement cited at the bar.

7. A similar question arose in the case of VIKRAMSINH PRAVINSINH RANA V. STATE OF GUJARAT - 1988 (2) GLH 414. In that case some of the pages of the judgement supplied to the petitioner/detenu are not legible and Division Bench of this Court has held that it would amount to non-communication of the grounds and it also adversely affected the right of the petitioner's making an effective representation to the concerned authority and therefore, order of detention was quashed and set aside.

8. Applying the facts of the aforesaid case to the facts of the present case, at the cost of repetition be it stated that some of the pages, more particularly page Nos. 113, 337 and 375 which are relating to the FIR supplied by the detaining authority to the petitioner, are illegible and therefore, it can be said that non-supply of the legible copies has seriously prejudiced the petitioner's right in making an effective representation and on this ground order of detention stands vitiated. The infirmity in this regard is violative of constitutional safeguard enshrined in Article 22(5) of the Constitution and therefore, continued detention is held to be illegal.

9. Seen in the above context, the detention order is vulnerable, bad in the eyes of law and therefore liable to be quashed and set aside by allowing the petition.

10. For the foregoing reasons, petition succeeds and is accordingly allowed. The impugned order of detention dated February 16, 2001 is hereby quashed and set aside. The petitioner/detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if not required in connection with any other case. Rule is made absolute. No order as to costs. Direct service is permitted.

Jayanti * (A.M.Kapadia, J)